

Request for Proposals
Selection Committee
Assessment Recommendations



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Evaluation

- Competitive and non-biased process for the respondents (*internal interviews and external focus groups*).
- Selection committee decision is consistent with the criteria for the RFP (*random sampling process*).
- Process consistent with the established administrative regulations (*random sampling process*).
- Process facilitates the expected outcomes (*internal interviews and external focus groups*).



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Protocol for 2010-2011 RFP Review

HWS reviewed every fourth RFP for:

- Amount of contract
- Level of consistency or inconsistency between the RFP and the criteria used to make the final decision
- Amount of variation apparent on the ranking sheets among members
- Amount of written communication with vendors
- Timeline (defined as RFP issue date to City Council vote)



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Review Findings

Amount

- 8 were valued at \$25,000 or less
- 11 were valued at more than \$25,000 and less than \$100,000
- 11 were valued at \$100,000 or more

Consistency between RFP and Selection Committee Criteria

- 17 (57%) were viewed as being consistent
- 9 (30%) were viewed as being inconclusive
- 4 (13% were not used)
- No files were viewed as blatantly inconsistent



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Review Findings

Variation Among Committee Member Selection

- All files indicated variation, or disagreement, in ratings among selection committee members

Communication

- Limited written communication with vendors prior to final decision

Timeframe

- Average length for the process was 72 days



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Community Benchmarking

- Five out of the nine reported tailored ratings sheet
- Most have a decentralized organizational structure for procurement
- Six of nine communities had maximum purchasing authority of at least \$50,000 without council action
- According to some best practices, post-project evaluations should be a part of the project management for any RFP/bidding process



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Community Benchmarking

- Eight of the communities reported that the RFP to selection took between 30-90 days
- Three of the communities had a formal response process for communication and review with unsuccessful respondents
- Seven of nine communities offer some sort of vendor training to vendors and contractors who work with the community



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Internal Interviews and Focus Groups

Internal Interviews: Staff of Purchasing, Airport, Transit, Public Works and Utilities, Municipal Court, Property Management, MAPD/WAMPO and Law Departments

External Focus Groups: A total of 30 vendors were randomly selected and were invited; 15 participated



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Recommendations

RFP Development

- Develop effective RFPs
- Ensure criteria from the RFP and the Selection Committee evaluations are consistent

RFP Threshold

- Increase selection committee threshold to \$50,000

Blanket Services Rotation

- Address the issue of most “routine projects” have qualified vendors
- Assist with the significant amount of time involved in responding to RFPs

Recommendations

Elected Official Information

- Provide elected officials information of the legal and administrative obligations in the purchasing process

Selection Committee Membership

- Allow for department technical review for projects less than \$50,000
- Provide for more department representation
- Allow for greater flexibility with selection committee members



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

*Hugo Wall School
of Public Affairs*

Center for Urban Studies

Recommendations

Role of Purchasing and Accountability

- Create a “Roles and Expectations” guide
- Create a checklist to provide more detailed information on the selection process
- Increase training

Communication

- Notify the vendors of the “short-list” and the recommended vendor

Post Project Evaluation

- Develop quantifiable method to collect information

City of Wichita Staff Committee
Proposed Responses to
Assessment Recommendations



Response to Report Recommendations

- Cross-functional team consisting of City Staff representing the City Manager's Office, Finance (including Purchasing), Law and Public Works and Utilities Departments reviewed the report to improve the RFP process and address recommendations
- Staff prepared responses to address the report findings and recommendations and to identify proposed improvements to the RFP process

Improve RFP Development

- Purchasing to provide additional training to City staff on RFP development
- Timelines will be required and included in RFPs
- Purchasing will work with City staff to assist with improving details pertaining to the scope of the project and evaluation criteria
- Purchasing will ensure customized evaluation criteria are disclosed in RFPs



Improve RFP Development

- Propose issuance of RFPs to cover both the design concept and final design
- Firms would include a price range for both design services
- Staff would seek City Council approval for both the concept design and final design

Changes to RFP Thresholds

Proposed Changes to Signature Authorities

- The signature authority of the City Manager and Purchasing Manager would increase from \$25,000 to \$50,000
- Delegate purchasing authority to City Department Heads from \$2,500 to \$5,000

Change Order Revisions

Proposed Revisions to Change Orders

- Appropriate contingency amount will be identified for construction projects with the default being 10% of the bid amount
- City Manager or his designee will have authority to approve change orders based on authorized contingency amount

Blanket Service Contracts

- Staff will continue to review opportunities for additional blanket service contracts
- Qualified firms could be rotated to ensure that firms are not excluded from City work
- Supports a hybrid version of blanket contracts whereby a limited number of approved vendors (2-3 firms) could submit a bid based on the scope of work

Elected Official Information

- Information will be developed and communicated to better inform the City Council of legal and administrative obligations pertaining to the Purchasing process

Selection Committee Membership

- Amend Administrative Regulation 1.2 to allow initiating departments the ability to select committee members who are knowledgeable and possess the expertise to evaluate proposal submittal
- Increase the proposed authority to \$50,000 to allow for a department technical review in the evaluation process

Purchasing Roles and Accountability

- A “Roles and Expectations Guide” for selection committee members will be developed and communicated to City staff.
- Current RFP checklist will be revised and provided to project managers
- Review of the selection process by the Internal Auditor
- Appropriate training will be provided to internal and external stakeholders

Communication

- Purchasing will track projects and inform City Council through the entire RFP process
- Provide firms notification after short-listing
- Provide firms notification of proposed recommendation regarding selection prior to City Council approval

Questions